

A Sylloge of Minor Bucolic

I

In this article I use 'Minor Bucolic' to mean 'poems transmitted in bucolic manuscripts but not written by Theocritus'; thus the term includes, strictly speaking, pseudo-Theocritean poems, poems ascribed (correctly or otherwise) to Moschus and Bion, the Pattern Poems, and the poem called *Eἰς νεκρὸν Ἀδωνιν*. I use the Greek text of A.S.F. Gow in *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford 1952/1958) unless otherwise stated, and follow Gow's numbering of the so-called 'fragments' of Moschus and Bion in that edition; other scholars' numerations are given on p.186 of it. It is necessary to remember that Gow himself used a previous numeration, namely that of Wilamowitz (*Bucolici Graeci*, Oxford 1905/1910), when referring to Bion's fragments in his *magnum opus* on (and entitled) *Theocritus* (Cambridge 1950/1952). The numbering of Moschus' fragments is however the same. As poems traditionally ascribed to Moschus or Bion are mostly falsely or dubiously so ascribed, they are referred to by title or abbreviated title. Similar treatment is given to certain of the pseudo-Theocritean poems, namely *Idd.* 19, 20, 21, 23, as they are central to this study. The other pseudo-Theocritea, which are here marginal (*Idd.* 8, 9, 25, 27), are referred to in the traditional way, as are the authentic Theocritean idylls. Titles used, and their abbreviations, are thus as follows:

<i>traditional ascription</i>	<i>status thereof</i>	<i>traditional title</i>	<i>abbreviated title</i>
Theocr. 19	false	Κηριοκλέπτης	Ker.
Theocr. 20	false	Βουκολίσκος	Buk.
Theocr. 21	prob. false	Ἀλιεῖς	Hal.
Theocr. 23	false	Ἐραστής	Erast.
Moschus 1	correct	Ἔρως Δραπέτης	Drap.
Moschus 2	correct	Εὐρώπη	Eur.
Moschus 3	false	Ἐπιτάφιος Βίωνος	Ep. Bi.
Moschus 4	prob. false	Μεγάρα	Meg.
Bion 1	prob. true	Ἐπιτάφιος Ἀδώνιδος	Ep. Ad.
Bion 2	unproven	Ἐπιθαλ. Ἀχιλλέως κ. Δηιδამείας	EAD
olim Theocr. 30	false	Εἰς νεκρὸν Ἀδωνιν	ENA

Probably none of these titles is ancient; manuscript transmission of them is notoriously inconsistent and some may be the whim of individual copyists. They are not always accurate: the protagonist of *Eur.* is in fact called *Εὐρώπεια* (and not *Εὐρώπη*) every time she is named except the first; *Ep. Ad.* in the MSS is called *Ἀδώνιδος ἐπιτάφιος* (and not, *pace*

Gow and Gallavotti, 'Ἐπιτάφιος Ἀδωνίδος')¹ yet the lament in honour of its probable author is correctly called *Ep. Bi.*; *EAD* is supposed to be a 'wedding song' (ἐπιθαλάμιος) but does not visibly resemble one in the surviving portion of the poem, and Adonis has a lesser role in *ENA* than either Aphrodite or the boar that kills him. Convention however has its own force, whether in the ordering, nomenclature or manner of reference to material ancillary to 'core' bucolic poetry, and those who have used the work of innovators in these areas (notoriously Ahrens, Wilamowitz and Legrand, but also in smaller measure Edmonds, Gallavotti and Beckby) will be aware of the tiresome effect of attempts to side-step such convention.²

Greek Bucolic is transmitted in three distinct groups or 'families' of manuscripts,³ known as Ambrosian, Laurentian and Vatican;⁴ from these it quickly emerges that *Idd.* 1–18 of Theocritus comprise a 'core',⁵ and that *Idd.* 19–30 together with the poems ascribed to Moschus and Bion are in some way secondary, comprising an appendix to core Theocritus and occurring in relatively few MSS, in some cases only one. *Idd.* 8 and 9, though now recognised as non-Theocritean,⁶ none the less have a certain claim to being regarded as part of the core: they are included in MSS that contain nothing else (the 'familia Vaticana'), they are visibly bucolic in the lexical sense of 'pastoral', they have papyrus support,⁷ they are accompanied by scholia, they were evidently known to and used by Vergil,⁸ and their text is relatively sound. In most of these respects the position with the appendix poems is rather different: few of them are found in more than one MS family, only one (*Id.* 27) is bucolic in the lexical sense, none have scholia, many of them (including most of the ones under discussion) have major

¹ Many editors, including Gow and Gallavotti, invert the title. Marco Fantuzzi (1985) gets it right in the body of his text, though in an appendix called 'Paternità e Datazione' reprinted from an earlier publication he had claimed that neither MS contained any indication of authorship (op.cit. 139).

² See Hiller (1888) n.1; Gow, *Theocritus* 1.lxvii.

³ Division into 'families' goes back to C. Wendel (1920) and is expounded in detail by Gow, *Theocritus* 1.xxx–xlvi, and by Gallavotti 243–260.

⁴ Designation of a given MS is however no indication of its 'family'. This is particularly the case with MSS which transmit non-core material.

⁵ Dr Peter Hicks has pointed out to me that in some respects *Idd.* 1–15 form a more closely-knit core, as *Idd.* 16–18 are not always included in some Vatican MSS, and in Laurentian MSS occur mixed up with non-core poems in the sequence: *Id.* 16, *Id.* 25, *Meg.*, *Id.* 17, *Ep. Bi.*, *Id.* 22, *Id.* 18. The point is in any case irrelevant to the present paper as *Idd.* 16–18 play no part in it.

⁶ *Idd.* 8 and 9 are transmitted with the same Theocritean pedigree as any other 'core' idylls. However, unlike other core poems they have no separate titles and were first suspected by L. Valckenaer in the late eighteenth century. They stand apart for a number of reasons listed by Gow, *Theocritus* 2.170–1. Further, *Id.* 9 is clearly intended as a follow-up to *Id.* 8 and is of visibly lower quality than either *Id.* 8 or authentic Theocritus. Thus the two poems will almost certainly have had different authors. Some editors have defended the authenticity of *Id.* 8 or of parts of it; no one, in modern times at least, has sprung to the defence of *Id.* 9.

⁷ Papyrus support for *Id.* 8 is well known; for *Id.* 9 see Gallavotti (1984) 3.

⁸ For this see Gow, *Theocritus* 2.171, 185. The *Eclogues* in question are mostly the third (vv. 1, 32–4, 50, 58–9, 80) and the seventh (vv. 1, 4–5, 7, 18, 21, 29–30, 53–56, 70), forming a matching pair in the *Eclogue* book.

textual difficulties, while (except *Idd.* 8 and 9) no non-Theocritean poem has yet been found on papyrus.

Seven appendix poems (*Ker.*, *Buk.*, *Hal.*, *Erast.*, *Ep. Ad.*, *EAD*, *ENA*) are found only in one or the other (or both) of two MSS of the Laurentian family: Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1824 ('V') and Codex Parisinus Graecus 2832 ('Tr'). One other poem (*Drap.*), which is amply attested elsewhere, occurs among them. These eight poems, which are here called the Group of Eight, have at first glance little in common, yet seem to form a collection or *sylloge* of some interest, not least because the two Laurentian MSS that transmit them are on the basis of common errors clearly copies of a common antigraph (which Wilamowitz⁹ following Hiller¹⁰ called ϕ), of which we have no other descendants.¹¹ Tr has now been dated to the first years of the fourteenth century,¹² probably between 1306 and 1320, and represents the editorial supervision if not the actual hand¹³ of Demetrios Triklinios (c.1280–1340) in Thessaloniki; Gallavotti calls this MS 'R' to dispel the impression that it is by Triklinios in person, but admits to its having his editorial stamp.¹⁴ V is, on the basis of watermarks, of about the same period or very slightly earlier.¹⁵ We do not know who wrote V, but it has the appearance of being a less scholarly compilation than Tr, though in a neater hand. V has been mutilated, and a copy of it called 'X' (= Cod. Vat. Gr. 1311) serves as a primary source where V is defective. Tr is illegible in places, and here one of several copies can be useful, most often Cod. Vat. Gr. 1379, though its compiler himself had trouble in reading Tr at times, and made further errors of his own. Neither V in its present condition nor Tr contains all eight poems. V suffered mutilation both before and after X was copied from it, as we know from the pattern of correspondence between X and V in general, though mutilation prior to copying did not touch on the eight poems here in question; thus X is our primary source for the Group of Eight as a whole. Tr on the other hand was compiled on a selective principle as Triklinios wished to collate only poems which he held to be by Theocritus. We know this from several points: omission of poems known (*Drap.*, *Eur.*) or deduced (*Ker.*, *ENA*) not to be by him, continuous numeration after the initial heading

⁹ Wilamowitz (1906) 69–84.

¹⁰ Hiller (1888) 2.

¹¹ Gallavotti claimed in 1946/1955 that Cod. Laurentianus Conv. Soppr. 15 (= 'W') was a twin of V, and thus also a copy of ϕ . He later modified this position, returning to that of previous scholars (Hiller, Wilamowitz) that made W a descendant of V. See Gallavotti (1982) 3–22. W is however incomplete and includes none of the Group of Eight.

¹² This is earlier than previously supposed. See Aubreton (1949) 21–23.

¹³ The hands of Triklinios in person and of the compiler of Tr are similar, but not identical (from personal inspection). Triklinios' hand can be clearly seen in photographs in Koster (1957) frontispiece and plates I–III. Schools of Byzantine scholars tend to be identifiable by similar hands (information from Dr Peter Hicks); some differences still remain of course perceptible.

¹⁴ Gallavotti 256: 'Triclinius ipse dicitur librum conscripsisse, quod si minime probandum censeo ... nullum dubium est quin triclinianam recensionem praebeat.'

¹⁵ See Gallavotti (1982) 12 n.8. This suggests the period 1297–1318 for V, which is thereby a good century earlier than thought by Gow (*Theocritus* i.xliii; *Bucolici Graeci* xiv), or previously by Gallavotti (254).

Θεοκρίτου βουκολικά, ascription of every single appendix poem (*Idd.* 16, 25, *Meg.*, 17, *Ep. Bi.*, 22, 18, *Buk.*, *Hal.*, *Ep. Ad.*, *Erast.*, *EAD*) expressly to Theocritus,¹⁶ Θεοκρίτου εἰδυλλίων τέλος placed after *Syrinx* (first occurrence) and *Ara Dos.*, the two Pattern Poems which follow the Group of Eight poems, though *Syrinx* is then repeated after that point. Thus Triklinios held to be genuinely Theocritean a number of poems today no longer assigned to him (*Idd.* 20, 21, 23, 25, *Ep. Bi.*, *Meg.*, *Ep. Ad.*, *EAD*) while he had no knowledge of others now recognised as authentic (*Idd.* 24, 26, 28–30). Within the Group of Eight, the last poem, viz. *EAD*, is broken off in exactly the same place in both X and Tr, which confirms that V (= antigraph of X) and Tr are copies of a common source and also makes it impossible to know how long *EAD* originally was, or whether it was really the last of a series. The eight poems, in the order and condition in which they occur in Tr, V and X, are as follows:

order	trad. name	short title	length	Tr	V	X
[1]	[Theocr.] 20	<i>Buk.</i> *	45	yes	no	yes
[2]	[Theocr.] 21	<i>Hal.</i>	67	yes	no	yes
[3]	Moschus 1	<i>Drap.</i> §	30	no	18–end	yes
[4]	[Theocr.] 19	<i>Ker.</i>	8	no	yes	yes
[5]	Bion 1	<i>Ep. Ad.</i>	98	yes	yes	yes
[6]	<i>Εἰς νεκρ.</i> "Αδ.	<i>ENA</i>	46	no	yes	yes
[7]	[Theocr.] 23	<i>Erast.</i> #	63	yes	1–55	yes
[8]	[Bion] 2	<i>EAD</i>	?	1–32	no	1–32

* Lines 1–4 also occur attached to AP 9.136, which is a six-line poem (or fragment?) by Cyrus of Panopolis, who held office in Constantinople in A.D. 441. The lines are found both in the Palatine MS itself and in one MS (= Cod. Laur. Gr. 31.28) of the Planudean collection. (For this, see Hiller 70–73; Wilamowitz 76; Gallavotti xxxv; Gow, *Theocritus* 2.364). The lemmatist to the Palatine MS recognised the lines as out of place, writing against them τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπιδεικτικόν ἀλλ' ἐρωτικόν· κακῶς οὖν ἐνταῦθα κείται. Ahrens had on the basis of these four lines tentatively attributed *Buk.* to Cyrus; his arguments are convincingly refuted by Hiller.

§ This poem is also found in 'S' (= Cod. Laur. Gr. 32.16), which in spite of its designation is non-Laurentian, Stob. 4.20.56 (*Flor.* 64.20) and AP 9.440. All sources except V (where the beginning is missing) but including X (= copy of V) give it to Moschus, who is also specified as 'Syracusan' (S, AP) or 'Sicilian' (Stobaeus). Its authorship is thus well attested.

Five lines of this poem (28–32), of which two (30–31) are very possibly spurious, occur in Cod. Baroccianus 50, held in the Bodleian. The MS is described by Wilamowitz (*Textgeschichte* 75) as dating from the tenth century and containing a valuable and learned miscellany; the lines from *Erast.*, whose authenticity Wilamowitz defends, are apparently used as 'padding' to fill out the bottom of a page. Gallavotti

¹⁶ Contrary to the impression created by Gow's sporadic mention of authorial attributions in *Bucolici Graeci*, every 'appendix' poem in Tr is expressly ascribed to Theocritus (from personal inspection). This fact was recorded by Hiller (1888) 58–59 and Wilamowitz (1906) 70, but seems since to have lain unnoticed, being nowhere mentioned by Edmonds, Legrand, Gow, Gallavotti or Beckby. It follows that in *Theocritus* 1.xxxvii–xiv, Gow's practice of asterisking those (pseudo-) Moschean or Bionean items which a given MS ascribes to Theocritus is, to say the least, erratic and highly misleading.

(128), though he square-brackets lines 30–31, finds them imitated at Nemesianus 4.21 f., suggesting that if they were interpolated this happened before about A.D. 280 at the latest. Gow however (*Theocritus* 2.411) doubts whether Nemesianus was consciously imitating either the author of *Erast.* or, separately, the compiler of lines 30–31.

II

None of the eight poems can be dated with any precision. Since *Drap.* is known to be by Moschus we have an approximate date in that author's floruit (mid-2nd century B.C.), while *ENA* has every indication of being much later, and certainly the last of the eight, most probably composed well into the Christian era. On metrical grounds Wilamowitz put it as late as between the fourth and the sixth century (*Textgeschichte* 71). The remaining six poems contain indications of probably dating from the period between 100 B.C. and A.D. 100, as numerous features are, measured by classical or mainstream Hellenistic canons, 'late', i.e. not attested, or at least not frequently attested, before about 100 B.C.:

Βουκολίσκος

θηλύνετο (v. 14), used where we might have expected διεθρύπτετο, even though the latter fits metrically, and further has two attestations in authentic Theocritus (*Id.* 6.15 and 15.99 MSS, the latter altered by Gow).

κρήγυον (v. 19) is clearly being used to mean 'true'. κρήγυος meaning 'good' is Homeric (*Il.* 11.106), a meaning also attested in Hellenistic times: Theocr. *Ep.* 19.3; *AP* 7.355 (= Damagetus); *AP* 9.335 (= Leonidas of Tarentum); Herondas 4.46 and 6.39, but the only other clear instance where (as here) it can only mean 'true' is *AP* 5.58 (= Archias, inaccurately recorded in LSJ as *AP* 5.57). *AP* 7.648 (= Leonidas again) is a borderline case; a prima-facie claim for 'true' does not totally exclude 'good'.¹⁷

δῶνακι (v. 29): δόναξ (mostly plural) is classical, indeed Homeric (*Il.* 10.467; *Od.* 14.474); δοῦναξ is found twice in Leonidas of Tarentum, plural in *AP* 6.296, singular (meaning 'fishing rod') in *AP* 7.504. The form δῶναξ may be consciously Doric, cf. κῶρα for κούρα (Theocr. *Id.* 1.82, *Ep. Ad.* 96, *Ep. Bi.* 119), κῶρος for κούρος (Theocr. *Id.* 15.120), βωκόλος for βουκόλος (*EAD* 10), τῶσδε τῶς κυναγῶς for τοῦσδε τοὺς κυναγούς (*ENA* 25), indeed MSS βωκόλος in this poem at vv. 3, 40 and 42 where it is routinely altered to βουκόλος by analogy with lines 3 (as attached to *AP* 9.136), 32, 34, 37, 38. All but one of these gratuitous Doricisms occur in Adonis- or Bion-related poems, whereas authentic Theocritus otherwise draws the line at these particular Doricisms, using

¹⁷ Gow defends the 'true' interpretation of κρήγυον in *AP* 7.648, though he remarks how it seems to have arisen from a misunderstanding of the Homeric word (as, indeed, at *Buk.* 19), and its close association with ἦδει might be held to support this interpretation. At the same time, understanding the word as 'good' coheres with the tone of the poem as a whole (= the virtue of Aristokrates), and makes a neat contrast with γυναικῶν ... τὴν ἀλιτοφροσύνην in the punch line. The issue is in part philosophical (what is 'good' is ultimately 'true' anyway), and is not made any easier by insoluble textual uncertainty in the immediately preceding lines of Leonidas' poem.

κοῦρος/κούρα where a long vowel is called for (*Idd.* 16.1, 70, 83; 17.36, 22.5, 179—all non-Doric idylls), and βοῦς and its various compounds frequently throughout the Doric idylls as well. The one occurrence of *donax* in probably authentic Theocritus (epig. 2, which even if not Theocritean is likely to be third century: see Gow ad loc.) is spelt with *omicron* and used, as in Homer, in the plural to mean ‘double pipe’. Sources for the epigram variously and unevenly Doricise the language (see Gow’s apparatus), but are unanimous in offering δόνακας. A much later imitation of it (*AP* 6.78, Eratosthenes Scholasticus, 6th century A.D.) is heavily Doricised but none the less retains τῶς τηρητῶς δόνακας, this last presumably for metrical convenience. We might then surmise that δῶναξ is later than Theocritus (who could *ex hypothesi* have written, but in fact chose not to write, δῶνακα τὸν τηρητόν) or Leonidas (who could have written δῶναξ but in fact, despite being a Doric-speaker, did not).

πλαγιαύλω (v. 29): the word is not otherwise attested before known Bion. It is not in authentic Theocritus, even though in the bucolic idylls and epigrams he has ample occasion to mention musical instruments. It occurs in Bion fr. 10.7. The simple αὐλός also occurs both here and in the Bion fragment, but the other two musical instruments occurring in each place differ: in *Buk.* 28–9 *συρίγξ* and *δῶναξ*; in Bion fr. 10.8 *χέλυσ* and *κίθαρις*.

Ἀλιεῖς

ἀθλήματα (v. 9): ἀθλημα in classical Greek means ‘contest’ (thus like ἀθλησις). The word in the sense of ‘equipment’ (= the means of pursuing the activity of ἀθλεῖν) is otherwise unattested, and may well be a later development, though this cannot be conclusively proved.

ἰχθῦα (v. 45), ἰχθύν (v. 49). The usual accusative is ἰχθύν. ἰχθῦα is found at *AP* 9.227 = Bionor, first century A.D. as proven by a datable reference in *AP* 9.423; the ‘Bianor’ of Vergil’s *Ecl.* 9.60 thus cannot be that poet. Other accusative singulars in -υα (for -υν) are listed by Gow, of which just one (βότρυα in Euphorion fr. 149) is earlier than Bionor. ἰχθύν is said (by Herodian) to have been used by Pindar but was held in ancient times to be unusual; Gow notes however that the short vowel ‘has other early analogies’. Use of ἰχθῦα and ἰχθύν (of whatever quantity) within five lines is remarkable in itself.

Form variation: the conjunction of variant forms (ἰχθῦα/-ύν within five lines) in the same poem suggests lateness: it is found in Bion (fr. 2.7 and 15–17 *ἔαρπειρα*, fr. 9.8–10 *μέλπω/μελίσδω*; fr. 10.2–6 *νηπίαχον/νήπιος*), and with some textual and other uncertainties in *Ep. Ad.*, which is itself one of the *sylloge* poems and is likely to be by Bion: *κεῖται/κέκλιται* 7/79; *πλοκαμίδας/νήπλεκτος* MSS 20/21; *Ἀσσύριον/Συριοῖσι* 24/77; *μηρῶν* MSS/μηρία 26/84; *ἄνδρα/άνερα* 29/68; *νεκρός/νέκυς* 69/70. It is also found copiously in the *Lament for Bion* (= *Ep. Bi.*), viz. *ἀδόνες!* *Ἀθῶν/ἀδονίδες* (9/38/46), *βουκόλος/βούτας* (11/65/81), forms of *μελίσδω* (15/60/118/119) and *μέλπω* (20/80/94), of *μέλισμα* (55/92) and *μέλος* (12/22/28/58/94/107/122), of *ᾄδω/αἰείδω* in consecutive lines (21–2) and generally (42/106; 16/38/78/81/126), *αἰοδά/ᾠδά* (12/54/97;

15/94/112), γράω both active and middle (24/87/3), ἄλμα/ἄλς (61/74), υἷα/υἷέα (73/75/79), τόσον with one *sigma* (88–90) but τοσσούτον with two (111). Further, the phenomenon is not altogether alien to *EAD*, which may also be by Bion: αἰδῶ/ᾄδω 3/5; μόνος/μούνος 15/28/30; σείο/σέο 31/32. In addition to that, all three Bion-related items (Bion fragments, *Ep. Ad.*, *Ep. Bi.*) contain several instances of both *sigma* and *tau* variants of the word for ‘thou’ (thus τῦ/σύ, etc.), and it is tempting to read a τῦ (for τί) into the first line of *EAD* also, contrasting with σείο/σέο in the last surviving lines; the first line as it stands is not unintelligible, but the forward position of τί, and its separation from the noun it goes with (μέλος), ring somewhat oddly. What is at issue here is not so much the occurrence of form variation in pre-Bionean verse, as its relative infrequency. For instance, similar variation of form is found with words for ‘sheep’ in authentic Theocritus within three lines: *Id.* 1.9–11: οἶδα/δῖν; and over a broader stretch of verse in *Id.* 5 (vv. 3, 24, 57, 139, 144, 149) and in probably non-authentic *Id.* 8 (35, 63 MSS, 70) the changes are rung on various forms of ἀμνάς/ἀμνίσ/ἀμνός and ἀρήν (i.e. ἄρνα/ἄρνός/ἄρνι, etc.). On the whole however Theocritus prefers lexis to form variation: thus βόες/ταῦροι/δαμάλαι/πόρτιες for ‘cattle’ within two lines (*Id.* 1.74–75), πράγος/αἰξί/χίμαρος for ‘goat’ within three (*Id.* 1.4–6), with ἔριφος just twenty lines later (26), οἶδα/ἄρνα/ἄρνα/δῖν for ‘sheep’ within three (as above). Pseudo-Theocritus offers us three (arguably four) words for ‘cattle’ in one line, at *Id.* 9.3 (μόσχοι/βόες/στεῖραι¹⁸/ταῦροι).

There just might also be singular ἐντί at v. 34; the MSS have σχόλλονται, from which Reiske proposed σχολά ἐντι, towards which Gow (though himself printing ἐστί) is favourable. In other words, ἐντί is a conjecture, but one based on an unambiguous but meaningless reading ending in -ντι in both MSS (= X, Tr). By way of counter-argument, Gow remarks that ἐντί is a common error in MSS, including some of authentic Theocritus; this is likely to explain his own preference for ἐστί here.

Κηριοκλέπτης

ἐντί singular again (v. 6), which is here the reading of the one MS (= V) that transmits the poem. Gow (ad loc.) remarking on the pervasiveness of ἐντί in bucolic MSS notes that *Ker.* ‘hardly deserves the same protection’ as that which he accords to MSS of authentic Theocritus.

ἔεις at v. 8 is Wilamowitz’ conjecture (accepted by Gow). Neither it nor MS ἔης are otherwise attested, and Wilamowitz’ conjecture is made on the presupposition that the poem is late in any case. It must be said that the case for a late date for *Ker.* stands less on language alone—for a start,

¹⁸ It would seem from occurrences in the *Odyssey* (10.522 = 11.30; 20.186) that στεῖρα is best understood to be a noun meaning ‘a cow that has not given birth’ rather than ‘a cow that cannot conceive’, as the gift of a sterile animal is no great sacrifice, whereas that of a potential bull-breeder with a productive life still ahead of it clearly is. It is true that the word later came to be a female adjective meaning ‘sterile’, and is so used of infertile women in the New Testament: Luke 1.7, 1.36, 23.29; Gal. 4.27, the last-named quoting the Septuagint at Isaiah 54.1.

there is so little of it to judge—than on the shortness, flippancy and general shallowness of the poem as a (miniature) whole.

Ἐπιτάφιος Ἀδώνιδος

For form variation as a feature of Bion in general, and in *Ep. Ad.* in particular, see above on *ἰχθύα/ἰχθύν* in *Hal.* and *loci* indicated there.

Striking variety in choice and contrastive use of names for Aphrodite: *Κυθήρα* (v. 36), *Παφία* used solely as a name (v. 64), *Διώνη* referring to Aphrodite outright (v. 93 MSS; many, including Gow and Gallavotti, follow Ahrens in emending it out), all this over and above the ‘standard’ names of *Κύπρις*, *Κυθήρεια* and *Ἀφροδίτα*. There is also *Κώρα* (without benefit of article) as an unadorned name for Persephone (v. 96). Adonis is *τὸν υἱέα τῷ Κινύραο* in v. 91, but something similar is found earlier, if in a different form (*Κινύρεω νέον ἔρνος*), at AP 7.407 (= Dioscorides).

Ἔραστῆς

The poem contains numerous unmistakable echoes of *Ep. Ad.*, and one of known Bion (i.e. of Bion’s fragments), which are dealt with below. These obviously argue for a date not earlier than *Ep. Ad.* (*vide inferius*).

ἐταῖρος used to mean ‘homosexual lover’ (vv. 45, 48). The verb *ἐταιρεῖν* in the sexual sense is however attested before the fifth century,¹⁹ and the use of *ἐταῖρα* (‘courtesan’ rather than ‘prostitute’) is well known.

Ἐπιθαλάμιος Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Διδαμείας

There are no clear signs of lateness in the language as such, unless we count *βωκόλος* in v. 10 for *βουκόλος*,²⁰ or *νύμφᾱ* in v. 28; the latter is Homeric (*Il.* 3.130, *Od.* 4.743), but *EAD* reproduces neither the Homeric phraseology of *νύμφᾱ φίλη* nor the same *sedes metrica*. Several expressions however evoke other poems in the series: with *βωκόλος* as a lover (v. 10) cf. the list in *Buk.* 34–41; with *θηλύνετο* (v. 18) cf. *Buk.* 14: *θηλύνετο*; with *ἐβάδιζε* (v. 20) cf. *Erast.* 22: *βαδίζω*; with *χιονέαις πόρφυρε* (v. 24) cf. *Ep. Ad.* 27: *χιονέοι ... πορφύροντο*; with *κόμας δ’ ἐπύκαζε* (v. 20) cf. *Buk.* 22: *δ’ ἐπύκαζεν ὑπῆναν*; with *κνώσσουσι* (v. 27) cf. *Hal.* 65: *κνώσσων*; with *μούνα ... καθεύδεις* (v. 28) cf. *Buk.* 45: *μούνα ... καθεύδοι*.

Further, *Ker.* must be later than *Drap.*, which is its model. *Erast.* markedly imitates *Ep. Ad.* at a number of places, far too many to be

¹⁹ See Dover (1978) 20 f. What he says about *ἐταῖρος/ἐταῖρα* in Greek is largely true in English as well: the words ‘companion’, ‘partner’ or even ‘friend’, in themselves quite sexless, acquire unmistakable sexual connotations in contexts of cohabitation or certain categories of marital irregularity.

²⁰ Gow prints *βωκόλος* at *EAD* 10, but *βουκόλος* at *Buk.* 3, 32, 37, 40, 42, and everywhere else, as did Legrand and Wilamowitz before him; Gallavotti prints *βωκόλος* at *EAD* 10 and throughout *Buk.* (so did Hiller). Edmonds, Ahrens and most pre-modern editors printed *βουκόλος* throughout. The reading in Tr (and in X) is *βωκόλος* at *EAD* 10 and throughout *Buk.*, sometimes (in Tr) with *-ου-* or *βουκόλος* written in as a gloss. The reading at *Buk.* 3 as attached to AP 9.136 is *βουκόλος*. The issue is more a matter of dialect than of dating.

attributable to chance (5, 19, 25, 40, 41, 45; cf. *Ep. Ad.* 17, 52, 48, 45, 13, 1 and *passim* respectively); thus *Erast.* must be later than *Ep. Ad.* or its probable author Bion;²¹ even if Bion is not the author of *Ep. Ad.* he (*Bion fr.* 14.5)²² is imitated at *Erast.* 2. Irrespective of its authorship *Ep. Ad.* is in view of its frequent use of exotic names for goddesses (see above) unlikely to be much earlier than mid-first century. An approximate date for this poem may be provided by Ovid. *Amores* 3.9, while commemorating the death of Tibullus, seems to allude to *Ep. Ad.* at two places: vv. 7–8 (cf. *Ep. Ad.* 81–2) and 15–16 (cf. *Ep. Ad.* 7–8, also *Ep. Bi.* 68–9). This suggests that Tibullus' death (19 B.C.) comprises a *terminus ante quem* for both *Ep. Ad.* and *Ep. Bi.*, and since the Greek poems are not otherwise much alluded to by Roman writers,²³ it may be supposed that they were written and circulated not very long before; what is not solely speculation is the witness that Ovid seems to give in support of the thesis that the dead hero of *Ep. Bi.* is in fact the author of *Ep. Ad.* In addition, *Ep. Bi.*—obviously written after the death of Bion—seems to have been either the source or the beneficiary of several of the expressions in the preamble to *EAD*, over and above *EAD*'s employment of expressions from other Group of Eight poems; cf. *EAD* 1–4 with *Ep. Bi.* 120–126. Thus an approximate—very approximate—chronology might be as follows:

- Buk.*: The era of conscious Doricisms, not all of which are either metrically or stylistically necessary (*Εὐνικαῖ ἔβαλ' Ἀθάνας/δῶναξ/μῶνα*, and the bucolic evocations of vv. 32–42), much as in, say, *Ep. Bi.* and of the same period, thus in the era of Bion; independently of this, in any case not earlier than Bion, cf. *πλαγίαυλος* in *Buk.* 29, Bion *fr.* 10.7.
- Hal.*: No close linguistic indication. The poem concerns the poor fisherman, a common theme from Leonidas of Tarentum (early third century B.C.) onwards.
- Ker.*: Later than Moschus, earlier than Pseudo-Anacreon 35 (which is undatable).
- Ep. Ad.*: Probably later than c.60 B.C., most probably before 18 B.C.
- Erast.*: Later than *Ep. Ad.*, probably later than known Bion (i.e. the fragments).

²¹ On Bion as the probable author of *Ep. Ad.* see Fantuzzi (1985) 139–146; Matthews (1990) 32–52, and below in the body of the text.

²² Those using Gow's *Theocritus* on echoes of Bion in *Ker.*, *Buk.*, *Hal.* or *Erast.* should remember that Gow was then still using Wilamowitz' edition as regards the ordering and numbering of Bion's fragments. See introductory remarks.

²³ Vergil, *Ecl.* 10.9 f. alludes to *Id.* 1.66 f., which is a model for both *Ep. Ad.* and *Ep. Bi.*, but Vergil does not draw on Greek bucolic lament directly, unless we are to see *Ep. Ad.* 8 f., 32 f. or *Ep. Bi.* 23–24 imitated at *Ecl.* 5.22–28, or *Ep. Bi.* 80–84 underlying *Ecl.* 6.3–5. Catullus and Vergil both show some acquaintance with Bion, but in both cases at least as much with the fragments as with *Ep. Ad.* The same is true for Ovid, whose *gutta cavat lapidem, non vi sed saepe cadendo* has an ancestor (as well as *Lucr.* 4.1286) in *Bion fr.* 4 (and earlier; Bion is citing a proverb: *fr.* 4.1: ὅπως λόγος).

EAD: Later than the above; the latest of the hexameter poems of the group.

Over and above objective evidence for chronology, one cannot escape the subjective feeling on reading the poems that they are rather too sentimental, too morbid, in some cases too tasteless, too inane, to be earlier than mid-first-century creations, and a date well into the first or even the second Christian century remains possible for most of them; not, however, if the Ovid hypothesis is right, for *Ep. Ad.*, which is the only poem with a plausible and concrete *terminus ante quem*. One poem however (*Hal.*) is largely exempt from this particular criticism, and might (though it need not) even be earlier than *Drap.* It also stands apart on metrical grounds, and this area will now be examined.

III

A metrical analysis of the seven hexameter poems now follows. As most of the anonymous six are unlikely to be earlier than Bion (see above), the analysis includes also the anonymous lament on the death of that poet (*Ep. Bi.*), which must have been written fairly shortly after Bion's death and thus is likely to be contemporary. In addition, comparable statistics for Theocritus, Moschus and Bion are added as a control: for Theocritus they are subdivided between the bucolic idylls (*Idd.* 1, 3–7, 10–11), the mimes (*Idd.* 2, 14, 15, 18) and hymns and *epyllia* (*Idd.* 12, 13, 16, 17, 22, 24, 26) and are expressed in percentages drawn partly from the work of Halperin (1983) and West (1982), and their sources (see Statistical Note), and partly on the present writer's own computation. For Moschus the sample comprises the 166 lines of *Europa* (Moschus' *Drap.* being itself under scrutiny) and for Bion the 112 reliable lines of the fragments. The computation is based on the number of *reliable* lines in each poem: lines generally thought to be spurious (so square-bracketed by Gow), incomplete or irremediably corrupt (so obelised by Gow) are thus not here taken into account. The refrain of *Ep. Ad.*, which varies continuously, has been counted once for each distinct formulation; that of *Ep. Bi.*, which is invariable, has been counted only once. These poems are thus, for the purposes of this analysis, respectively of 94 and 114 effective lines. The poems are arranged so as to highlight the 'anonymous six' as a sub-group, following *Drap.* and preceding *Ep. Bi.*, which may thus approximate to their chronological order; the Theocritean, Moschean and Bionian control figures are however put last.

Some technical definitions in advance may prove to be useful:

Verse-design: the arrangement of dactyls and spondees within the first five feet of the hexameter verse. In theory 32 verse-designs are possible, and for reader convenience these are tabulated below.

Masculine caesura: the word-break in the second or third foot directly after the first element, thus – | ~ ~ or – | – . By contrast, the word-break at the point ~ | ~ is called feminine caesura.

Bucolic diaeresis: word-end coinciding with end of the fourth foot. Enclitics are for this purpose regarded as part of the preceding word.²⁴

‘Sperrung’: no satisfactory English name for this phenomenon is known. The term ‘Sperrung’ (‘interlocking device’) was coined initially in connection with Latin prosody, but the practice is also found in Greek. It is the feature whereby the last word of a hexameter or pentameter line and the last word before the mid-line caesura comprise a noun and attributive adjective. It is not clear whether two nouns in apposition, or noun and predicative adjective, may also be held to comprise ‘Sperrung’ (see # below). The most illustrious (and persistent) exemplifier must be Propertius, who uses it 12 times in as many consecutive lines and altogether over 20 times in 38 lines in his first elegy (Prop. 1.1.1–12 and 1–38).

Metrical analysis

<i>poem</i>	<i>no. of lines</i>	<i>reliable lines</i>	<i>no. of diff. verse-designs</i>	<i>% masc. caesura*</i>	<i>% buc. diaeresis</i>	<i>cases of Sperrung#</i>
<i>Drap.</i>	30	29	7	21%	79%	2 (0)
<i>Buk.</i>	45	42	10	40%	83%	1
<i>Hal.</i>	67	62	16	52%	65%	2
<i>Ker.</i>	8	8	5	37%	75%	0
<i>Ep. Ad.</i>	98	94	12	19%	77%	1 (0)
<i>Erast.</i>	63	55	11	30%	75%	1 (0)
<i>EAD</i>	32	28	9	40%	89%	1 (0)
<i>Ep. Bi.</i>	126	114	11	30%	82%	5§
[Control]						
Theocritus			28			
(bucolic)				50%	79%	@ figures
(mimetic)				48%	59%	not fully
(hymnic-epyllic)				28%	49%	available
Moschus’ <i>Europa</i>			21	41%	67%	16 (14)
Bion’s fragments			12	13%	70%	6 (5)

²⁴ What a ‘word’ comprises for metrical purposes is an area of endless debate; see Maas, *Greek Metre* [transl. H. Lloyd-Jones] (Oxford 1962) 84 f.; West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 25–26; Bulloch, *CQ* 20 (1970) 260–266. The criterion adopted here is that ‘word’ is understood in the typographical sense, with the proviso that unaccented words (proclitics and enclitics) are counted as part of the word which they precede or follow. Allowance must however be made for strings of enclitics, for words in crasis or tmesis, and for those few prepositions that are unaccented (ἐκ, εἰς, ἐν, ὧς, of disputed metrical status), and here there is no hard and fast rule. This criterion is thus a rule of thumb rather than a principle, and rests on uncertain theoretical foundations: the written accentual system which is our only effective guide to it postdates by some centuries the metrical phenomena which it helps us to describe.

- * The percentage is calculated in respect of lines with caesura in the second or third foot, thus ignoring the lines (mostly 1 or 2 per poem) with no caesura.
- # In several cases it is doubtful exactly what should be counted as 'Sperrung' (see definition). The bracketed figures comprise a more conservative estimate.
- § Sperrung occurs in the refrain, which appears 13–14 times in the poem. It is counted here only once, but the cumulative effect must be taken into account.
- @ A partial analysis of Theocritus' practice in bucolic idylls only suggests that he varied his use of 'Sperrung' considerably; see note 2 below.

Notes:

1. Although figures for caesura have been standardised, a percentage based on a small number of lines (*Ker/Drap./EAD*) necessarily has less weight than one based on a larger number. This is above all true of *Ker.*, with only 8 lines.
 2. Known poets score differently in different poems. No one who was unaware of the common authorship of *Drap.* and *Europa* would be encouraged by the above to think they were written by the same person. Likewise, Theocritus uses only 12 verse-designs in, say, *Idd.* 3 and 6 (comprising 100 lines) but he elsewhere uses 15 verse-designs in 66 different lines (excluding refrains) in the *Thyrsis-Song* (*Id.* 1.64–145). He uses Sperrung only twice (possibly thrice) in 100 lines in *Idd.* 3 and 6, but five times in 66 different lines in the *Thyrsis-Song*. His bucolic diaeresis rating for single poems ranges from 45% (*Id.* 15) to 89% (*Id.* 5); within his bucolic idylls the lowest is *Id.* 7 at 74%, while his highest non-bucolic scorer is *Id.* 14 (67%). Thus the gap between the lowest bucolic and the highest non-bucolic scorer is considerably narrower than between the extremes recorded by the bucolic idylls. Average positions remain distinct however: bucolic 79%, mimetic 59%, epyllic 49%. These figures²⁵ do not take account of the epigrams, nor—obviously—of poems not in hexameters (*Idd.* 28–30), while the allocation of some of the non-bucolic idylls as between the 'mimetic' and the 'hymnic-epyllic' group remains in part disputable. Bion's fragments, which are quoted by Stobaeus as bucolic, display a lower bucolic diaeresis rating than *Ep. Ad.* (probably by Bion), which is not bucolic in any real sense. Overall, bucolic diaeresis is confirmed as a genre-marker, but caution is also suggested when dealing with single, short poems, as it has been shown that considerable fluctuation within and between groups of poems may be expected. The widespread use of bucolic diaeresis in poems not visibly bucolic in the usual lexical sense (including practically all of surviving authentic Moschus and Bion, who are repeatedly cited in late antiquity as 'bucolic' poets²⁶) underlines how
- 25 Figures for authentic Theocritus are taken partly from Halperin (1983), in part also from West (see previous note), while those concerning 'Sperrung' (in selected authentic bucolic Theocritus only) are my own. See Statistical Note for bibliographical details. Figures for Pseudo-Theocritus, and for all Moschus and Bion (authentic or not) are entirely my own.
- 26 Moschus and Bion are known as 'bucolic' following their classification as such by Stobaeus and by the compiler(s) of the *Suda*. Moschus is closely associated with Theocritus in the *Suda*, and in the heading to one MS of *Ep. Bi.* Bion is copiously

the criterion of what comprises a genre must have passed from semantic to metrical considerations very early on.

3. When that has been said, some interesting points emerge. The anonymous six portray a more limited range of verse-designs, rather lower frequency of masculine caesura, and also a little less bucolic diaeresis, than mainstream (= bucolic) Theocritus, or Moschus. In these respects the anonymous six more often resemble known Bion (= fragments) or his eulogiser (= *Ep. Bi.*).
4. The poem that most diverges from the models is *Ep. Ad.* with few verse-designs (although *Ep. Ad.* is by a safe margin the longest of the Group of Eight, being 50% longer than the runner-up, which is *Hal.*), 19% masculine and thus 81% feminine caesura. If recurrent refrains were counted each time the divergence would be even more striking. The bucolic diaeresis rating is normal however.
5. On the basis of the above, the 'odd man out' among the anonymous six is *Hal.* with noticeably more verse-designs than any of the others, more masculine than feminine caesura and a relatively low bucolic diaeresis rating. It is also the only poem of the group to have more than one case of Sperrung, though each of the known bucolic models tabulated also has several instances.
6. It will be seen further on that *Buk.* and *Hal.* have a certain amount in common as regards language and even, marginally, prosody. However the above analysis suggests that they stand apart in this area. Whether or not this factor may be allowed to influence the question of a common authorship must remain *sub iudice*, but the fact of prosodic diversity cannot be altogether ignored.
7. The frequency of Sperrung is uniformly very low in the Group of Eight poems, including *Drap.*, whereas it is high in Moschus' only long poem: at least 14 cases in 166 lines. For Theocritus high frequency is found in the Thyrsis-song (21 times in altogether 82 lines; counting identical refrains only once each, that amounts to five times in 66 different lines). It also occurs six times in the 112 reliable lines of Bion's fragments; oddly, all six instances occur in just two fragments (*frr.* 11 and 12) totalling 15 lines.
8. From the above we may deduce that the most distinctive prosodic feature of the 'anonymous six' is their non-use of Sperrung. This, more than their bucolic diaeresis ratings, would seem to mark them off as a group from known bucolic poets. A second noteworthy observation is that they are (except *Hal.*) less adventuresome than Moschus and bucolic (or indeed mimetic) Theocritus in range of verse-designs or in frequency of masculine caesura, in which areas they are mostly at par with known Bion or his eulogiser.

identified as 'bucolic' in *Ep. Bi.* (11, 20 f., 65, 81 f., 95) and in some MSS headings to it (see Gow's apparatus); he is kept apart from the Borysthenite by being designated Bion of Smyrna, or *Βίων ὁ βοικόλος*. In view of this it is a paradox that little of surviving Moschus and almost nothing of surviving Bion can be classified as bucolic in the lexical sense.

There now follows an analysis of single verse-designs. No models are here examined as it has already been shown that both Theocritus and Moschus (though not Bion) use a wider range of verse-designs than the authors of the anonymous poems; in fact Theocritus uses altogether 28 verse-designs in just under 2000 hexameter lines (not counting epigrams), while Moschus uses 21 in 225 surviving lines, indeed all of them in his one long surviving poem of 166 lines; moreover, we have seen that the practice of both varies widely from one poem to another. In the following tables 'd' indicates a dactyl (— ~ ~) and 's' a spondee (— —) in the first five feet; the sixth is irrelevant. Thirty-two verse designs are theoretically possible; they are here tabulated as follows:

1. d d d d d	9. s d d s d	17. s s s d d	25. d s d s s
2. s d d d d	10. s d d d s	18. s s d s d	26. d d s s s
3. d s d d d	11. d s s d d	19. s s d d s	27. s s s s d
4. d d s d d	12. d s d s d	20. s d s s d	28. s s s d s
5. d d d s d	13. d s d d s	21. s d s d s	29. s s d s s
6. d d d d s	14. d d s s d	22. s d d s s	30. s d s s s
7. s s d d d	15. d d s d s	23. d s s s d	31. d s s s s
8. s d s d d	16. d d d s s	24. d s s d s	32. s s s s s

The table below shows only those verse-designs that are actually represented in one or more of the seven hexameter poems, with the frequencies for each, based on the number of reliable lines (for which see above).

Verse-design	<i>Buk.</i> (42)	<i>Hal.</i> (62)	<i>Drap.</i> (29)	<i>Ker.</i> (8)	<i>Ep. Ad.</i> (94)	<i>Erast.</i> (55)	<i>EAD</i> (28)
1. d d d d d	12	13	12	2	27	12	11
2. s d d d d	6	5	7	3	18	11	4
3. d s d d d	9	10	4		18	12	5
4. d d s d d	4	2	1		2	2	1
5. d d d s d	3	3	3		12*	3	1
6. d d d d s					3		
7. s s d d d	1	7			2	4	
8. s d s d d	2	2	1	1	1	3	
9. s d d s d	1	4		1	6*	1	2
10. s d d d s					1		
11. d s s d d	3	6	1	1	3	3	2
12. d s d s d	1	1			1	3	
14. d d s s d		2					
17. s s s d d		2					1
18. s s d s d		2				1	1
23. d s s s d		1					
24. d s s d s		1					
27. s s s s d		1					

* The relatively high frequency of verse-designs 5 and 9 in *Ep. Ad.* is explained by a refrain component containing 's' in the fourth foot and recurring frequently.

A number of interesting conclusions can be drawn. The following table shows some of them; all figures are in percentages, rounded to the nearest whole number. Percentages may not always total 100 due to rounding. As with previous tables, percentages for short poems (above all for *Ker.*, given in halves) must be taken with caution.

percentage of	<i>Buk.</i> (42)	<i>Hal.</i> (62)	<i>Drap.</i> (29)	<i>Ker.</i> (8)	<i>Ep. Ad.</i> (94)	<i>Erast.</i> (55)	<i>EAD</i> (28)
all-d lines	29%	21%	41%	25%	29%	22%	39%
one-s lines	52%	32%	52%	37.5%	56%	51%	39%
two-s lines	19%	35%	7%	37.5%	15%	25%	14%
three-s lines	—	10%	—	—	—	2%	7%
four-s lines	—	2%	—	—	—	—	—
all-s lines: none							

VD = verse-designs:

VD 1–3	64%	45%	79%	62.5%	67%	64%	71%
VD 1–3/7	67%	56%	79%	62.5%	69%	71%	71%
VD 1–5/7–9/11–12	100%	85%	100%	100%	96%	98%	93%
VD 6/10/24	—	2%	—	—	4%	—	—
VD 14/17–18/23	—	10%	—	—	—	2%	7%
VD 27	—	2%	—	—	—	—	—

In short, the poems are characterised by a low proportion of spondee lines. Not counting the extremely short poem *Ker.*, no other poem has two or more spondees in more than about a quarter of its lines, and where there are two spondees at least one, and quite often both, will come in the first two feet. Lines with more than two spondees or with a spondee in the fifth foot are distinctly rare. The only poem to depart from these norms with any frequency is *Hal.*, which has the lowest score on all-dactyl lines and is the only full-length poem²⁷ to score less than half on one-spondee lines. Thus it has far and away the highest score on lines with two spondees and a near-monopoly on three or more. Four poems (*Buk.*, *Drap.*, *Ker.*, *Ep. Ad.*) register no VD higher than no. 12. *Hal.* however has 9 lines (15%) in the higher VDs. *Ep. Ad.* is the only poem apart from *Hal.* with spondees in the fifth foot, but this happens relatively often (4 times). Without going into every detail, a brief comparison with bucolic authentic Theocritus and with Moschus' *Europa* shows that these poets also favour VDs 1–3 (Theocritus around 52%, Moschus 51%). Moschus however, as well as a fair sprinkling of middle-frequency VDs (nos. 4–12), also employs ten VDs

²⁷ What comprises a 'full-length' poem is arbitrary, but on the principle that a 'short' poem is of epigrammatic length, can easily be memorised, and fits onto one manuscript page of manageable size, the upper limit for a 'short' poem might be set at around 30 lines. *Ker.* is unquestionably short; *Drap.* and *EAD* are borderline cases, but *EAD* is incomplete and its reliable lines are just 28 in number, while *Drap.* scores high in one-spondee lines anyway.

between nos. 13 and 28 to a total of 15 instances in one long poem; Theocritus, while he uses more VDs than Moschus overall, puts fewer in any one poem. Moschus also puts a spondee into the fifth foot no fewer than 20 times (thus 12%), whereas Theocritus rates low here: epyllic 7%, mimetic 3%, bucolic a mere 1.3%. Bion's fragments score 67% for VDs 1–3, and one single instance of a VD lower than no.12; also one single instance of a spondee in the fifth foot. The author of the *Ep. Bi.* also has 67% for VDs 1–3, three instances (all VD no. 17) of a VD lower than no. 12, but nowhere puts a spondee in the fifth foot.

As a one-sentence summary of this metrical analysis, we may say that one poem of the anonymous six, namely *Hal.*, approximates to the metrical practice of Theocritus and Moschus, whereas all the others (and also *Drap.*, even though it is known to be by Moschus) are closer to that of known Bion (= fragments) and to his anonymous eulogiser (= author of *Ep. Bi.*). A corollary is that the analysis tends to strengthen the hypothesis that *Ep. Ad.* is also by Bion (see below), and if this is so then Ovid provides—as previously suggested—an approximate *terminus ante quem* for Bion's floruit, and also a probable *terminus post quem* for one other poem of the six, namely *Erast.*

IV

One intriguing observation on the Group of Eight is that the eight poems seem to fall into matching pairs. This point, and speculation as to why it should be so, will now be developed; elements of subjective judgement necessarily intrude, but good *prima-facie* reasons for some, at least, of the tentative conclusions that may be drawn are not entirely lacking.

The thematic relationship between the components of the second pair (*Drap.* and *Ker.*), viz. Eros and the bee, is obvious; it is in fact a commonplace of the love-ditty, and was picked up later by an anonymous writer of Anacreontics²⁸ and later again by the twelfth-century writer Niketas Eugenianos,²⁹ in a fashion whereby each later poem draws more on its immediate predecessor than on earlier ones. Thematic similarity, viz. the death of Adonis, is also evident (on the surface at any rate) between the components of the third pair (*Ep. Ad.* and *ENA*). These are however enormously different in other respects: *Ep. Ad.* is an extremely subtle, carefully composed, delicately balanced, arguably very appealing³⁰ poem, whereas *ENA* is hack work of the worst kind: tasteless, silly, repulsive.³¹

²⁸ Pseudo-Anacreon 35, beginning *Ἔρως ποτ' ἐν ῥόδῳ αἶν.*

²⁹ Niketas Eugenianos 4.313–324; text in *Erotici Scriptores Graeci*, ed. R. Hercher (Leipzig 1854).

³⁰ In the opinion of the present writer; in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries however it was often considered to be in poor taste: 'de hoc carmine ... ob miserarum lamentationes molesto' (Meineke 1856); 'florid, unreal, monotonous' (Murray 1897); 'imitative ... valueless ... uninspired' (Mackail 1911); 'shrill ... heated ... distasteful' (Gow 1953).

³¹ Again a personal view, and again the contrary assessment was long in vogue, going back at least as far as the late seventeenth century; notably in the early edition of H.B.

The first pair (*Buk.* and *Hal.*) and the fourth (*Erast.* and *EAD*) are less obviously paired in any thematic sense, but without too much mental gymnastics some points of similarity can be detected, and these will now be examined at some length.

To take the last pair first: *Erast.* concerns a male lover who spurns his boyfriend; the latter hangs himself while the former is killed by a falling statue. The death of the lover is seen as poetic justice; the moral of the poem is thereby 'do as you would be done by' and is phrased (vv. 62–63) in a manner reminiscent of Moschus *fr.* 2.7–8. The poem thus concerns unnatural love, though for an ancient critic the unnaturalness lies less in its homosexual character than in the unmotivated and ungrateful rejection of the boyfriend by the lover. In this it has a certain resemblance also to *Buk.*, with the important difference however that *Buk.* is intended to be comic: the reader can laugh at the country bumpkin, who is portrayed as a ridiculous figure clearly modelled on Theocritus' Polyphemus in *Idd.* 6 and 11, especially the latter. While the country bumpkin has got his obvious grievances against Eunika, the poem also provides the reader with ample reason for her rejection of his advances: he is rustic, ugly, uncouth and smelly; she is the opposite of all these things. Thus, putting aside modern concepts of being fair to all parties and following instead the rules of the game of love as conceived in ancient times, the country bumpkin gets what he deserves. It is in this respect more than in what it is now fashionable to call 'sexual orientation' that the theme of *Erast.* is 'unnatural' in a way that that of *Buk.* is not. Turning to *EAD*, we see that here too there is a certain kind of unnaturalness. Despite its title the poem does not provide any clear indication from the 31½ lines remaining that it is in fact a wedding-song, nor that the somewhat ambiguous relationship between the two main characters will necessarily result in a wedding. True, Achilles feels the pull of love, and Deidameia seems to be willing enough to encourage him: she lets him kiss her hand (23) and help her at spinning (24), though the reference to Polyphemus and Galatea in the preamble (2–3) might rather suggest the classic pursuit by the lusty male of the reluctant, shy or coquettish female. On the other hand Achilles, we are told, also behaves most effeminately: he dons female apparel (7), avoids military service (12–15), prefers wool to weapons (16), and 'with his lily-white hand had the κόρος of a maiden, and took on the appearance of a girl. He preened himself as girls do, took on their rosy hue in his snowy cheeks, imitated their gait and took to combing his hair in front of a mirror' (16–20). Later, words are twice put into his mouth which employ adjectives with feminine terminations where masculine ones would be expected: once for Achilles alone (28: ἐγὼ μούνα), and once for Achilles and Deidameia together (29–30: αἱ δύο παρθενικαὶ συνομάλικες, αἱ δύο καλαὶ ἰ ἀλλὰ μόνα κατὰ λέκτρα καθεύδομες). It is at that point that the reliable text of the poem ends. On the other hand, we are told expressly (21: θυμὸν δ' ἀνέρος εἶχε καὶ ἀνέρος εἶχεν ἔρωτα) that Achilles felt the *thymos* of a man, and also had the (capacity to) love of a man; the word for 'of a man' (*ἀνέρος*)

de Longepierre (Longopetraeus), Paris 1686, and in the many issues of *Minor Bucolic* in the late eighteenth.

occurs twice within four words, thus stressing forcefully that these, at least, were masculine features, but the very fact that such masculinity on the part of Achilles (of all people!) needed stressing is itself suspicious. There is further a passage at lines 8–9 of the poem which is clearly textually corrupt, and thus not entirely reducible to any objective meaning, but one possible reconstruction³² of line 9 would have it read *ῥείδῃ κατὰ παστὸν Ἀχιλλέα Δηιδάμεια* ('Deidameia knew Achilles in the way of the bridal chamber'). If that is right, then it is a little odd in this place to speak of the woman 'knowing' the man sexually, when the more usual position is that the man 'knows' the woman; it is not as if Deidameia takes the initiative anywhere else, and the passage is at least as much about Achilles as about Deidameia, arguably more so. Wilamowitz (1906) did not conceal his almost prurient curiosity at this point; having asserted that the lines must concern 'the Real Thing' (*die Hauptsache*, i.e. sexual congress), he asks (p. 74): 'What did Deidameia do in bed with Achilles, such that he acted as if he were a girl?', and concludes that Deidameia 'invented' a playmate's role *as a man* (my italics, but 'invent' is the word used; the German is 'als Mann hat sie die Gespielin erfunden'). Be the details as they may, it would seem clear that we are here in the presence of some kind of sexual irregularity on the part of both characters; in that sense this poem too may be considered a poem of unnatural love. This 'unnatural' character persists even though the love affair in question is—at least on the surface—healthily heterosexual. It is in that sense that *Erast.* and *EAD* can be said to display a thematic link, and thus to comprise a pair.

The case of the first and second poems (*Buk.* and *Hal.*) is more problematic. Though not exactly an *erōtylon* (cf. *Bion fr.* 10.10 and 13), *Buk.* has something of the love-ditty and much of the theme of love-turned-sour: both are common enough within Minor Bucolic, as indeed in all bucolic, and are liberally represented in genuine Theocritus. The theme of *Hal.* on the other hand (= the hardship of being a fisherman) is almost unique in bucolic poetry absolutely, being marginally touched on only in *Id.* 1.39–44, Moschus *fr.* 1 and possibly Theocritus *fr.* 3, though it is common in other kinds of poetry in the late-Hellenistic period. All the other Group of Eight poems concern love in some form or another: happy or unhappy, fulfilled or unrequited, human in most cases but also divine (*Ep. Ad.*) or animal (*ENA*) on occasion. The one poem that does not match this description is *Hal.*, and it is intriguing to ask oneself why, and what (if anything) links *Hal.* with *Buk.* in the Group of Eight. On the surface extremely little, but on a closer analysis of circumstances of transmission, of some peculiarities of language and prosody, and of allusion to a common model, some points of contact may be seen to emerge.

Two of the circumstances of transmission, trivial in themselves, have already been alluded to. Firstly in the Palatine Anthology, the first four lines of *Buk.* are attracted to a six-line poem by Cyrus of Panopolis (*AP*

³² Gow so prints the line unobelised, but it must remain very dubious. Where Gow (following Edmonds 1928) has *ῥείδῃ*, Gallavotti has *κῆλησεν*. So does Beckby (1975). Legrand (1927) put *εὐνάσθη*, Wilamowitz (1910) *ἀνδρ' ἦνει*, Ahrens (1855) *οὐδ' εὐδεν*. Hiller reproduced the meaningless MS *ἀειδήνηα τὰ παστὸν*.

9.136). Cyrus' poem is a brief eulogy of the country life, and although *βουκόλος* does not occur in it, mention of pastoral activity does (1: *δασύτριχα μῆλα νομεύειν*), which explains its attachment to *Buk.* (cf. *Buk.* 3, 19, 32, 34–41). However, AP 9.136 has a moral rather more in common with *Hal.* than with *Buk.*: the hardships of urban life, like those of fishing, can be alleviated by recourse to the land (cf. *Hal.* 59–60); the poem also by its city–country contrast suggests that *Buk.* and *Hal.* be seen as an exercise in contrasting the professions of *βουκόλος* and *ἀλιεύς*. Cyrus was active towards the middle of the fifth century of the Christian era; it might thus be conjectured that by that time *Buk.* and *Hal.* had come to be associated with each other. Secondly: it has been pointed out that the early thirteenth-century MS Tr purports to collate only poems its compiler held to be Theocritean. One copy of Tr, namely 'C' (= Codex Ambrosianus Graecus 104), expressly attributes all the poems to Theocritus with one exception; that exception is *Hal.* It is beyond any doubt that the compiler of C knew that he was copying a supposedly Theocritean poem (Tr says so, as does an earlier copy of it, namely Cod. Vat. Gr. 1379), and thus it would seem either that he regarded the poem as spurious and thus in Tr under false pretences, in which case he would surely have omitted it; or that he held the ascription to Theocritus of *Buk.* to cover *Hal.* as well, thereby seeing *Buk.* and *Hal.* as a pair; the latter hypothesis seems more likely. There is of course a third possibility: that he simply forgot to add the ascription.

The metrical analysis outlined above marks out *Hal.* as significantly different from the other six poems (and thus from *Buk.*) in overall prosodic shape, but there are two minor points of similarity. One is that of the very few instances of Sperrung in the Group of Eight poems, two occur in very similar circumstances: at *Buk.* 25: *γλαυκάς* ... *Ἀθάνας* and *Hal.* 55: *γλαυκάς* ... *Ἀμφιτρίτας*. Thus both involve *γλαυκάς* with a goddess whose name begins with *alpha*. Secondly, if one compares the 42 reliable lines of *Buk.* with the first 42 reliable lines of *Hal.*—on the face of it a perfectly fair procedure, the more so as the poem takes a distinct turn at about that point, with details of the fisherman's dream—the two poems turn out to be more closely aligned to each other in verse-designs (10:11); the extra five verse-designs of *Hal.* all come in the remaining 20 reliable lines. Masculine caesura and bucolic diaeresis however occur in much the same proportion as for the whole poem. Both of these points are trivial, but one wonders whether both are entirely coincidental.

Regarding language there is one rather more substantial point of agreement: use of the dual. In the bucolic corpus the dual is distinctly rare: it occurs normatively in genuine Theocritus only in *Idd.* 22 (lines 1, 137–8, 139–40, 169–70, 175–6, 182, 191) and 24 (lines 17, 30, 55, 58, 75* [on the asterisk see below], 91), sometimes combined with *ἄμφω*, *δύοιδύνω* or *δισσώ*. While *Idd.* 22 and 24 are both Theocritean, neither is either bucolic or in any sense erotic, and being respectively a hymn and an epyllion they are in the epic dialect and thus stand somewhat aside from 'core' Theocritus or the mainstream of Theocritus' known work. The dual also occurs twice in *Id.* 12.11–13, where however Theocritus seems to be

alluding to (or inventing) a proverb in Homeric language (see Gow, *Theocritus* 2.223 ad loc.), a factor which may also attract the dual pronoun *νόων* in line 11. *Id.* 17.26 has the unique pronoun combination *ἄμφω ... σφιν*, in which Theocritus goes out of his way to avoid the proper dual form *ἄμφοιν*; Gow, ad loc., should again be consulted (ibid. 330–1). On the other hand, duals occur relatively often among a number of non-Theocritean poems (*Idd.* 8.3–4; 20.12; 21.8, 9, 48; 23.8*; 25.69, 72?, 137?, 153–4, 214, 241*, 260; *Eur.* 86, 99, 116; *Meg.* 32). These listings do not take account of *ἄμφω* or *ἄμφότεροι* used with the grammar of the plural, which is frequent and normal throughout the period. Asterisked items are those which use the clearly dual noun *ῥοσε* yet in an oblique-case plural form (*ῥοσσωνιῶσσοις*); queried ones a dual form dependent on an uncertain reading of the text. As with genuine Theocritus, the highest scorers (*Id.* 25, *Europa*) are epyllia displaying linguistic features common in epic, a factor that also holds for the one occurrence in *Meg.*, which though not a real epyllion is nevertheless in the epic style. Now, including epigrams and fragments but without other fringe items (*ENA*, Pseudo-Anacreon, Pattern Poems, Rainer Papyrus) the bucolic corpus totals around 3570 lines of which—accepting *Idd.* 1–7, 10–18, 22, 24, 26, 28–30 as authentic—44% (1560 lines) is mainstream or ‘core’ Theocritus, 17% (615 lines) is other genuine Theocritus and 39% (1395 lines) is non-Theocritean. The above list shows that there are altogether 27 clear instances of the dual (not counting doubtful cases or *ἄμφω*-type words used with plural grammar), of which only two occur (together) in core Theocritus, 12 in *Idd.* 22 and 24, and 13 in non-Theocritean poems; and of these 13, eight are in epyllia, one is in *Buk.* and three in *Hal.* Thus *Buk.* and *Hal.*, though they comprise only 110 lines and thus barely 3% of the corpus, account between them for 15% of all occurrences of the dual and for 31% of non-Theocritean ones; if one subtracts from the corpus all hymnic and epyllic poems or imitations thereof (irrespective of authorship), the proportion is as high as 80% as we are left with only one instance of a dual (*Id.* 8.3–4: a single instance, though its dual character is heavily underscored by repetition) in a poem which is neither hymnic-epyllic, nor *Buk.*, nor *Hal.* This extraordinary statistic must surely be highly significant in any speculation as to why and how *Buk.* and *Hal.* are paired. Further, the condition of the text as transmitted at *Hal.* 57 (MSS *τῷγκίστρω*) might suggest an emendation involving dual *τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ* instead of the usually accepted plural one *τάγκίστρια*, following Brunck; while *Buk.* 9, though not strictly in need of emendation, lends itself to a stylistic reformulation (to avoid awkward repetition of *τοι*) involving dual *χείρε*. Thus these conjectures,³³ if accepted, would add one more dual form to each poem.

³³ A conjectural reformulation of *Buk.* 9 might run thus: *χείλεά τοι νοσέει· ἔσθ' ὃν τῷ χείρε μελαίνα*. A riskier conjecture for *Hal.* 56–57, though not without its foundation in the state of the MSS (see text), could be: *ἡρέμα δ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ 'κ' τοῖν ἀγκίστρον ἀπέλυσα / μὴ ποκα τῷ στόματος τῷγκίστρῳ χρυσὸν ἐχοίτην* or, if the *schema atticum* should also apply to duals, *χρυσῷ ἔλοι τι* with A.Y. Campbell, as noted with approval by Gow in *Theocritus* 2.380, 566.

Before we leave *Buk.* and *Hal.*, something must be said on the occurrence in both of numerous echoes of, or allusions to, another poem in the bucolic corpus, namely *Id.* 11. This idyll is genuine bucolic Theocritus and recounts the story of Polyphemus and Galatea; in it, Polyphemus bewails the fact that his advances are rejected by Galatea, despite his conviction of his own handsomeness. The whole poem is set within a framework of poetry being a remedy for the pains of love. It will be immediately clear that *Buk.* has quite a lot in common with *Id.* 11, which was certainly known to the composer of *Buk.* and used by him, if ineptly, as a model; cf. *Id.* 11.9 and 31, *Buk.* 23–4; *Id.* 11.11, *Buk.* 34; *Id.* 11.20–1, *Buk.* 26–7; *Id.* 11.46, *Buk.* 22; *Id.* 11.67, *Buk.* 18 and 42. However, though less obvious on the surface, there is also quite a close network of correspondence between *Id.* 11 and *Hal.*: both propound similar morals at the beginning (*Id.* 11.1–4, *Hal.* 1–5); both recall Hom. *Il.* 23.693 in mentioning seaweed (*Id.* 11.14, *Hal.* 10); both relish the sound of the sea in terms that again smack of Homer, if less directly (*Id.* 11.43: γλαυκὰν ... θάλασσαν, cf. Hom. *Il.* 16.34: γλαυκὴ ... θάλασσα; *Hal.* 18: τραφερὰν meaning ‘land’ with γὰν not expressed, cf. Hom. *Il.* 14.308 and *Od.* 20.98: ἐπὶ τραφερῇν τε καὶ ὑγρῇν); both refer to modes of passing the night (*Id.* 11.44, *Hal.* 22–24), though in clearly different ways; both dwell on the idea of a magical fish (*Id.* 11.54–55, *Hal.* 46–57); both preach the virtues of modesty: in *Id.* 11 the moral of being content with one’s lot (75) and in *Hal.* the setting for oneself of tangible goals (66); and finally both disparage gold at the end (*Id.* 11.81, *Hal.* 67). As an afterthought the Cyrus poem already mentioned (*AP* 9.136) not only suggests links between *Buk.* and *Hal.* as already seen, but also looks for solace for the poet’s problems in the *Pierides*, exactly as in *Id.* 11.1–3. Can all this be coincidence? Can it be that *Buk.* and *Hal.*, though two very dissimilar poems, are in quite different ways both inspired by the Polyphemus poem? Can this explain the attachment of the Cyrus poem, itself associable with *Id.* 11, to *Buk.* while seeming to have more in common with *Hal.*? Could this be one of the reasons why *Buk.* and *Hal.* come together in the manuscripts, and thus in the *sylloge*? Polyphemus, though unmentioned by name, seems to be the speaker of Bion *fr.* 16 (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν βασεῦμαι ... λισσόμενος Γαλάτειαν ἀπηνέα), and may further be that of the one-line *fr.* 15 (μορφὰ θηλυτέραςι πέλει καλόν, ἀνέρι δ’ ἀλκά), though the latter identification is contested. If Bion also wrote a Polyphemus poem of which *fr.* 16 is one extract and *fr.* 15 possibly another, it is perhaps less surprising to find *Buk.* and *Hal.* associated in a Bion-featuring *sylloge* through their common link with another Polyphemus poem, a point apparently also spotted by Cyrus.

V

I end with a speculation. Of the Group of Eight, two poems stand apart from the others: *Drap.* for being by a known author earlier than the probable period of the remaining poems, and for being securely transmitted independently of ϕ ; and *ENA* for being non-hexametric and likely to post-

date all the rest by a large margin. It is plausible that these two poems may have been added later to an anthology (*sylloge*) of six poems of which the first two (*Buk.* and *Hal.*) were held to comprise a pair, as were the last two (*Erast.* and *EAD*). The hypothesis is that an unknown hand added *Drap.* and *ENA* to the collection to make up the four pairs into which the *sylloge* in its existing form seems to fall. If that is the case then it transpires that the remaining six poems, which we have already had occasion to isolate as the 'anonymous six', are more homogeneous than the eight as transmitted: they are all in hexameters, they are all (not necessarily *Hal.*) likely to be of the same period, they are mostly (except *Hal.*) in some sense love poems, they are all of somewhat maudlin sentimentality, and they all qualify as 'bucolic' on purely formal metrical grounds (bucolic diaeresis); but perhaps even more importantly the avoidance of Sperrung is a prosodic feature that holds them together. It may be surmised that they comprised a distinct sub-collection, or *sylloge*, that got added to another *sylloge* (the run of Theocritean and non-Theocritean poems in Laurentian MSS from *Id.* 16 to *Id.* 18, for which see note 5), and thereby to the core poems of the bucolic corpus, through meeting one metrical criterion, yet differ from either Theocritus or Moschus on a variety of metrical grounds. It is a plausible hypothesis that the poems may have been written, or at least may at one time have been thought to have been written, by the same person, or otherwise associated with him. If the smaller *sylloge* is in some sense 'bucolic' yet is not to be identified with either Theocritus or Moschus, one inevitably thinks of the only other Greek bucolic writer known to us by name, Bion of Smyrna. The *Suda*, which apart from *Ep. Bi.* is our only hard source of biographical information about Bion, names him after Theocritus and Moschus in a linear progression that suggests chronological order,³⁴ implying that the interval between Bion and Moschus might be very approximately comparable to that between Moschus and Theocritus. If this is so, then we might posit a floruit in the mid-first century, which would match the tentative dating here suggested for the six anonymous poems. At the same time, one must not jump to conclusions. Triads of writers (tragedians, comedians, philosophers, historians) were the fashion for ancient literary biographers, and it does not follow from the *Suda* that only three Greek bucolic poets ever existed; on the contrary, one who was neither Theocritus nor Moschus nor Bion was the author of *Ep. Bi.*, another was the author of the undeniably bucolic *Id.* 9, and a probable third (if neither Theocritus nor the author of *Id.* 9) was the author of *Id.* 8. A fourth, though perhaps rather later, was the author of *Id.* 27, as this poem too is unmistakably bucolic lexically as well as metrically. We also have an aside by Servius who in his comments on Vergil's *Eclogues* (prooem. 2.14–16) describes how Vergil's intention was *ut imitetur Theocritum Syracusanum, meliorem Moscho et ceteris qui bucolica scripserunt*. Bion himself might

³⁴ Misattribution of *Ep. Bi.* to Moschus by Fulvio Orsini in 1568 has led to the false chronology whereby Bion was for centuries placed earlier than Moschus; some eighteenth-century editors considered Theocritus and Bion to be contemporaries. For this reason the ordering of poems in editions of all Greek bucolic was Theocritus–Bion–Moschus for three and a half centuries.

of course be one of the *ceteri*, but the expression suggests not only that there were several other bucolic poets, but that they comprised an identifiable group in Servius' use of *ceteri* (and not *alii*), a point largely lost³⁵ in the English word 'others'. It remains however an open question whether the *sylloge* comprising the core of the Group of Eight might not at one time have been thought to have a Bionean identity of a looser kind, which need not mean that Bion was actually the author of every poem.

The hypothesis is thus far unsupported; it is hitherto a speculation. Some support however comes from quite another quarter. Reference has repeatedly been made to the 'anonymous six', which is technically correct as the traditional ascriptions of those six poems have no ancient authority. Yet there are good, if not totally conclusive, grounds quite independent of anything said so far in this paper for attributing one of the 'anonymous six' to Bion, namely *Ep. Ad.*; see note 21 for references. Very briefly, the reasoning hinges on the evident allusion at *Ep. Bi.* 68–69 to *Ep. Ad.* 13–14, in such a way as strongly to suggest that the hero of the former poem is the author of the latter. Ovid's allusion in *Amores* 3.9 to the death of Adonis, while commemorating the death of a real poet (Tibullus), points in the same direction, as has been seen. Thus Bion may be accepted as the probable author of one of the six, which is thereby no longer quite so anonymous. It does not follow that Bion himself wrote the five remaining poems, though three of them (*Buk.*, *Ker.*, *EAD*) have at times been assigned to him, with varying degrees of probability and different motivations; the case for Bionean authorship of those poems is not particularly compelling but not to be excluded a priori. It is positively unlikely that *Hal.* was written by the author of *Ep. Ad.*, as the metrical position is so divergent, not to mention the near-total lack of thematic connection between *Hal.* and either certain or probable Bion (except, conceivably, *Bion fr.* 8); conversely just because *Erast.* plagiarises *Ep. Ad.* so baldly it is scarcely tenable that the two poems could have had a common author. No reputable poet repeats himself quite so blatantly in quite such non-comparable circumstances; nor—if *Ep. Ad.* is indeed the earlier poem and *Erast.* the later one, as seems probable—does he follow a good, carefully-constructed poem with a third-rate pastiche of it. Indeed if Bionean authorship were to be surmised for *Ep. Ad.*, *EAD*, *Ker.* and *Buk.* but rejected for *ENA*, *Erast.*, *Drap.* and *Hal.*, we should finish up with a compact group of eight poems falling into four pairs, each of which would then contain one poem by Bion and one poem not by him but in some sense either inspiring or being inspired by him. This hypothesis at least has the attraction of neatness, and accommodates the more likely candidates among the eight (or six) poems, without leading to untenable conclusions about the more obviously non-Bionean ones. A wider kind of association however can also be envisaged: poems evoking Bion, a so-called 'school of

³⁵ Not totally lost: English differentiates between 'others' and 'the others'. One modern tongue that shows a lexical distinction of the *ceteri/alii* kind in Latin is Russian (другие/иные: *drugie/inye*). On the other hand, and unlike most Indo-European tongues, neither Latin nor Russian has a definite article. It seems likely that these two sets of correspondences are correlated.

Bion' (Gottfried Hermann favoured the idea, as did Wilamowitz), an anthology of the simple life as later exemplified by Cyrus of Panopolis, or simply the musings of an unknown Byzantine anthologist puzzled (as we are) by the apparent contradiction between what we know *about* Bion (viz. that he was bucolic; see note 26), and what we have that is (or might be) *by* him: the strong contenders (fragments, *Ep. Ad.*) are not bucolic at all in the lexical sense, and other candidate pieces from among the *sylloge* (in order of likelihood *EAD*, *Ker.*, *Buk.*) only marginally so. A counter-argument here is that in any Bionese or Bion-related anthology that went beyond poems actually written by Bion one might well expect *Ep. Bi.* to figure prominently, and whereas *Ep. Bi.* also occurs in both V (in its original state) and Tr, it does not occur there within the Group of Eight poems. Be that as it may, it has been shown that there are good grounds for claiming that the six 'core' poems of the Group of Eight indeed comprise a minor *sylloge* within the 'appendix Laurentiana' with its own internal cohesion, its own poetic logic, its own identity, in the ways examined.³⁶

Bigorio, Switzerland

R.J.H. MATTHEWS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: I mostly follow the modern style of identifying written works by date, but as the second edition of Gow's *Theocritus* and the first edition of his *Bucolici Graeci* both came out in 1952, I refer to these by title. References to Gallavotti unadorned by year are to that scholar's *magnum opus* on Greek Bucolic, namely *Theocritus quique feruntur Bucolici Graeci*.

Ahrens, Heinrich Ludolf: *Bucolicorum Graecorum Theocriti Bionis Moschi Reliquiae* (Leipzig 1855).

Aubret, Robert: *Démétrius Triclinius et les recensions médiévales de Sophocle* (Paris 1949).

Beckby, Hermann: *Die griechischen Bukoliker: Theocrit Moschus Bion* (Meisenheim-am-Glan 1975).

Dover, K.J.: *Greek Homosexuality* (London 1978).

Edmonds, J.M.: *The Greek Bucolic Poets* (London/New York 1912/1928) [= Loeb ed.].

Fantuzzi, Marco: *Bionis Smyrnaei Adonidis Epitaphium* (Liverpool 1985).

Gallavotti, Carlo: *Theocritus quique feruntur Bucolici Graeci* (Roma 1946, 2nd ed. 1955). Unadorned 'Gallavotti' refers to the second edition.

—, 'La silloge tricliniana di teocrito e un codice paragino-laurenziano' in *Bollettino dei classici*, 3rd series, fasc. 3, 1982.

—, 'Nuovi papiri di Teocrito' in *Bollettino dei classici*, 3rd series, fasc. 5, 1984.

Gow, A.S.F.: *Theocritus* (Cambridge 1950, 2nd ed. 1952); referred to as *Theocritus*.

—, *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford 1952, 2nd ed. 1958) [= Oxford Classical Text].

—, *The Greek Bucolic Poets Translated with Brief Notes* (Cambridge 1953).

³⁶ This paper is in good part an expanded version of part of my doctoral thesis on the *Epitaphios Adonidos*, accepted at Berne in March 1991. I should like to re-record my deep gratitude to my former 'Doktorvater', Prof. Dr Thomas Gelzer (now Emeritus), for his stimulation, generosity, patience and help both in guiding the dissertation, and separately in encouraging the present extended rewrite of the first section of it. All responsibility for its contents remains, of course, solely my own. Acknowledgement is also due to Dr P.G.B. Hicks and to Mr R.W. Lamb for various forms of stimulus and encouragement, and to Dr Neil Hopkinson for his most helpful comments on an earlier draft.

- Halperin, David M.: *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (New Haven/London 1983).
- Hicks, Peter G.B.: *The Manuscript Tradition of Theocritus*, a hitherto (1994) unpublished doctoral thesis at Cambridge 1992.
- Hiller, Eduard: *Beiträge zur Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Leipzig 1888).
- Koster, W.J.W.: *Autour d'un manuscrit d'Aristophane, écrit par Démétrius Triclinius* (Groningen 1957).
- Legrand, Ph.-É.: *Bucoliques grecs II: Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion, Divers* (Paris 1927) [= Budé ed.].
- Mackail, J.W.: *Lectures on Greek Poetry* (London 1911).
- Matthews, R.J.H.: 'The Lament for Adonis: Questions of Authorship' in *Antichthon* 24 (1990) 32–52.
- Meineke, August: *Theocritus Bion Moschus* (Berlin 1856).
- Murray, Gilbert: *The Literature of Ancient Greece* (Chicago 1957) [= 1897 reprint].
- Wendel, Carl: *Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theocrit-Scholien* (Berlin 1920).
- Wilamowitz, Ulrich von (–Moellendorf): *Bucolici Graeci* (Oxford 1905, 2nd ed. 1910) [= Oxford Classical Text].
- . *Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker* (Berlin 1906).

STATISTICAL NOTE

Line computation for the metrical analysis embarked upon in this paper, apart from being extremely tedious, is bedevilled by a number of factors not perhaps obvious to the non-initiate: decisions of principle as to which poems should be included and which excluded, uncertainties of ascription and of classification, numerous textual obscurities, and unclear definitions of highly technical terms (such as, in this paper, bucolic, mimetic, hymnic, epyllic, bucolic diaeresis, 'Sperrung', even—in view of proclitics and enclitics—the exact prosodic borders of a 'word') lead to some variation in results claimed by one scholar or another, even when (as frequently) a given scholar takes a previous scholar's computations as his point of departure. The statistical information in this paper is taken largely from the following:

- (1) Martin L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford 1982) 152–157.
- (2) David M. Halperin, *Before Pastoral: Theocritus and the Ancient Tradition of Bucolic Poetry* (New Haven/London 1983) 263–6.
- (3) Sources for West and for Halperin—in both cases, mostly taken on trust—comprise earlier studies by Kunst, Maas, O'Neill, Van Sickle, Lesky, and Bulloch. These have however been consulted only very fleetingly.
- (4) The present writer's unpublished doctoral dissertation on the *Epitaphios Adonidos*. This involved direct computation of the relevant statistics for Moschos and Bion, for Pseudo-Theocr. *Idd.* 19–21, 23, and (selectively) for authentic bucolic Theocritus. Where computations overlap, results come out closely comparable to those of West, and a consistent 3–4% higher than those of Halperin; the latter is also demonstrably inconsistent in places.

These considerations should be taken into account in reading, digesting and interpreting the statistical information contained in this paper.

APPENDIX

Syllogai or anthologies of Bion (and particularly of Moschos and Bion) did not cease with the compiler of ϕ . They have continued, albeit in rather altered form, up to modern times. In 1565 printed editions of Minor Bucolic as such—i.e. just Moschos and Bion without Theocritus, though sometimes published with Callimachus, Anacreon, Musaeus or the 'Nine Poetesses'—start appearing, with a peak in the latter half of the eighteenth century: of the 16 editions of Minor Bucolic known to and inspected by the present writer, eight or just half lie within the period 1745–1795, which might be dubbed the 'Pentekontaëtia' of Minor Bucolic. It is likely that Vergil on the one hand, and Minor Bucolic on the other, were closer inspirers of eighteenth-century *Pastourelle* than all but the most obviously pastoral of

Theocritus' idylls. Of immediate interest here is the publication history of the eight poems comprising the Group of Eight, but this also involves the traditional canon of Moschus and Bion (titles and abbreviations as at the beginning of this paper) and one other Pseudo-Theocritean idyll (*Id.* 27 = *'Oaportús* → *Oar.*). There are also the short poems of Moschus and Bion, some but not all of them fragmentary, that are usually referred to as the 'fragments' of those poets, and are mostly preserved for us by the fifth-century excerptor Stobaeus. These last, not being 'Group of Eight' poems, are of less immediate relevance, but it is noteworthy that, apparently by an oversight of Stephanus or Meeterkerke, Bion *fr.* 11 was frequently assigned to Moschus (though Winterton queried this in 1652) until Valckenaer definitively rectified the matter in 1779, that different editors regarded different 'fragments' of Bion among (Gow's nos.) *fr.* 2, 9–10, 12–14 as complete short poems and Bion *fr.* 6 and 7 (or 7 and 8, or all three) as separate or contiguous parts of the same poem, that Bion's Stobaeus-transmitted fragments were not all published together until 1584 (by Vignon), and the remaining one (preserved by Orion) not until the 1840s (by Schneidewin, thence used by Hermann and by Meineke).

The *editio princeps* for all but one of the Group of Eight poems is the Aldine *Theocritus* of 1495 (Venice), which follows up 'core' Theocritus (*Id.* 1–18) with twelve other poems all attributed to him, in the following order: *Ep. Bi.*, *Eur.*, *Drap.*, *Ker.*, *Ep. Ad.*, *Buk.*, *Hal.*, *Meg.*, *Dioskouroi*, *Erast.*, *Syrinx*, *ENA*. The one Group of Eight poem not included is *EAD*, which will not be published until 1568. Of these, only one (*Dioskouroi* = *Id.* 22) is now held to be authentic Theocritus, one other (*Syrinx*) claims to be by him (lines 11–12; Gow discusses the claim but rejects it), while a third (*Meg.*) found a champion in Cholmeley in 1911. The others are all Group of Eight poems, or are Moschus- or Bion-related. An edition by Filippo Giunta (Florence, dated 1515 but actually 1516) grouped the relevant poems more closely, printing them consecutively in the order *Hal.*, *Erast.*, *Buk.*, *Ep. Ad.*, *ENA*, *Ep. Bi.*, *Drap.*, *Ker.*, as if Giunta had sensed an inner cohesion. 1565 sees the first edition of Minor Bucolic as such, with *Moschi Siculi et Bionis Smyrnaei Idyllia*, edited by Adolf Meeterkerke at Bruges. In this publication Moschus is credited with *Drap.*, *Eur.*, *Meg.*, (but not with *Ep. Bi.*) and with the three hexametric fragments, also with Bion *fr.* 11. *Ep. Ad.* is given to Bion. In 1566 Henri Étienne (Henricus Stephanus), *sine loco* but Paris, incorporated Meeterkerke's arrangement (though also giving *Ep. Bi.* to Moschus) in a major edition of all bucolic, often reprinted. In 1568 Fulvio Orsini published *Carmina Novem Illustrium Feminarum* at Antwerp. Bion and Moschus (in that order) follow the nine poetesses. The placing of Bion before Moschus seems prompted by the even then very dubious assumption that Moschus was the real author of *Ep. Bi.* Orsini is the *editor princeps* for *EAD*, which he ascribes to Bion, apparently on the rather flimsy evidence of bucolic names and phraseology also found in Bion. Further fragments are published, Bion *fr.* 11 being correctly ascribed. Vignon (1584, Geneva) adds Bion *fr.* 14, but still gives Bion *fr.* 11 to Moschus. The corpus of Minor Bucolic as we now understand it is thus virtually complete by the end of the sixteenth century. The pseudo-Theocritea and *ENA* however stand outside it, the latter being known as *carmen xxx* of Theocritus right up until the late nineteenth century, including by Wordsworth (Cambridge 1877).

Seventeenth and eighteenth century editions of Minor Bucolic show considerably more ingenuity than scholarship in assigning the poems they choose to include. Bion routinely precedes Moschus, loses Bion *fr.* 11 to him before 1780, and sees a selection of the complete short poems among his 'fragments' numbered among his 'idylls', following *Ep. Ad.* and preceding *EAD*. Other deviations from standard practice in the editing of Minor Bucolic are as follows:

- 1652 (London), David Whitford. Bion loses *EAD*. The book purports to comprise *Musaei Moschi et Bionis quae extant omnia*, but in fact several Theocritean idylls are added at the end, in random order: 2, 18, 9, 1, 3, 4, 23, 7, 8, and then, entitled only *Sarpedonis ad Glaucum*, *Il.* 12.310–328.
- 1686 (Paris), anonymous but H. de Longepierre/Longopetraeus. *ENA* is added after *Ep. Ad.* but is ascribed to Theocritus. Moschus loses *Eur.* but by way of compensation seems to gain *Oar.* as that poem follows the Moschus fragments though it is not expressly ascribed to him. Some French poems are included.
- 1746 (Venice), N. Schwabel. Moschus gains *Oar.* The book contains the first known word list for Moschus and Bion, but is otherwise noticeably less scholarly in fact than in intention, and contains a number of first-rate howlers.

- 1748 (Oxford), Thomas Heskin. Moschus gains *Oar.* and *Buk.* Heskin's notes are in good part a translation into Latin of Longepierre's, apparently thereby to make them more accessible (!) to English readers than the original French.
- 1752 (Leipzig), J. Schier. Moschus gains *Oar.* (and, as ever, Bion *fr.* 11), with a spirited defence of these ascriptions, while Schier criticises Heskin for not checking his sources. Both Moschus and Bion separately have word lists.
- 1780 (Leipzig), Thomas Harles. This is substantially a reworking of Heskin, thus *Oar.* and *Buk.* are given to Moschus. Bion *fr.* 11 is however restored to Bion, following Ludwig Valckenaer's *Carmina Bucolica* of the previous year.
- 1784 (Gotha), J.C.F. Manso. Manso seems to have predetermined that Bion and Moschus should father just ten poems each. Bion has *Ep. Ad.*, *EAD* and *fr.* 2, 8–14 (thus every 'fragment' that might possibly be a full poem), while Moschus has the usual canon, plus *Oar.* and *Buk.* Manso fills nearly 500 pages with his long introduction (over 50 pages are dedicated to the largely imaginary 'lives' of Moschus and Bion), the Greek text of these twenty poems and his German translation of them, and notes (in German), but his loquacity, his moral purpose and his enthusiasm are hardly matched by his scholarship.
- 1795 (London), G. Wakefield. *Oar.* and *Buk.* disappear from Moschus. Two further poems are added: *AP* 9.363 and 9.136. The former is attributed to Meleager, though Gow disputes this. The latter is held to be anonymous, but is in fact the Cyrus poem (*AP* 9.136) relevant to the link between *Buk.* and *Hal.*
- 1849 (Leipzig), Gottfried Hermann (posthumous publication). Bion gains *Ker.* and *fr.* 17 (for Hermann: no. 18). *Oar.* is added after Moschus but unascribed.
- 1868 (Tübingen), Chr. Ziegler. The corpus of *Minor Bucolic* is exactly as we know it today, at least as regards Moschus and Bion, except for the chronology.

Only in the twentieth century has the chronological confusion caused by Orsini been put straight: J.M. Edmonds in *The Greek Bucolic Poets* (London 1912) printed Bion before Moschus but expressed the view that the chronology was inverted. Ph.-É. Legrand in *Bucoliques Grecs II: Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion, Divers* (Paris 1927) is the first in modern times to print Moschus before Bion.